

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

WILLIAM M. SCHMALFELDT, SR.

\*

Plaintiff,

\*

v.

\*

Civil No. RDB-15-1241

PATRICK G. GRADY, et al.

\*

Defendants.

\*

\* \* \* \* \*

**ORDER**

This Court's previous Order (ECF#45) GRANTED the *Pro Se* Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss and contained a section listing findings of fact which included reference to Defendants not having filed an Answer. Presently pending before this Court is the Motion of the *Pro Se* Defendant Scott Hinckley to Strike That Order and Issue a New Order (ECF#47) clarifying that an Answer had in fact been filed. No opposition has been filed to this motion.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2016 that this Motion (ECF#47) is **GRANTED** and the Dismissal of this Action WITH PREJUDICE shall be MODIFIED to reflect that an Answer was filed by the Defendants. This case shall remain CLOSED and DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Richard D. Bennett  
United States District Judge